

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Pursuant to Applicants' response to the Examiner's previous restriction requirement, Applicants have withdrawn Claims 23-164, and Claims 1-22 remain in this application. Applicants have amended Claims 1-12, 14 and 18-19. No new matter was added by these amendments. Applicants request reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and these arguments.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 20 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended Claim 19 to depend from Claim 18 instead of Claim 1, which addresses the Examiner's §112 rejection of Claim 20. Applicants therefore request that the Examiner remove the §112 rejection of Claim 20.

The Examiner has further rejected Claims 1, 10, 15, 18 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Roelofsen ("TETRA Security"). Applicants traverse these rejections.

Applicants submit that the amendments to Claims 1 and 2 render these claims distinguishable from the Roelofsen reference. The embodiments of the invention recited in Claims 1 and 2 are methods having steps that are associated with three different system devices. In a first system device, a first encryption key associated with traffic encryption for group communications is generated, forwarded to and received in a second system device that is not a mobile station. This second system device, in turn, combines the first encryption key with a third encryption key to yield a second encryption key associated with traffic encryption for group communications. The second system device forwards the second encryption key to a third system device that is also not a mobile station and is not the first or the second system devices.

Roelofsen does not disclose all of the recitations of either Claim 1 or Claim 2. Roelofsen discloses four different keys that are generated and that are associated with traffic encryption for group communications. Those keys are the Common Cipher Key (CCK), the Group Cipher Key (GCK), the Modified Group Cipher Key (MGCK) and the Static Cipher Key (SCK). The reference explicitly states that three of these keys (CCK, GCK and SCK) are distributed to a mobile station and implies that the MGCK is distributed to a mobile station. However, the Roelofsen reference fails to disclose that any of these keys are forwarded to a system device other than the mobile station and accordingly does not disclose all of the limitations recited in

Claims 1 and 2 and included by dependency in Claims 10, 15 and 18. For these reasons, Applicants submit that Roelofsen does not anticipate Claims 1, 10, 15 and 18, and thus request that the Examiner remove the rejections of these claims based on the Roelofsen reference. For the same reasons, Roelofsen does not anticipate amended Claim 2.

The Examiner has further rejected: Claims 2-4, 6-8, 11-14, 16, and 17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roelofsen, and further in view of Hakim (US 4,841,433); Claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roelofsen, in view of Hakim and further in view of Jackson (US 6,477,387); Claims 9 and 22 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roelofsen in view of Hakim and further in view of Roelofsen ("Security Issues for TETRA Networks"); Claims 19 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roelofsen in view of Marshall (US 4,888,800); and Claim 21 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roelofsen in view of Chang (US 5,329,573). Applicants traverse these rejections.

As argued above, the primary Roelofsen reference fails to disclose all of the limitations recited in Claims 1 and 2, which are also included by dependency in Claims 3-9, 11-14, 16-17 and 19-22. Similarly, the Hakim, Jackson, Marshall, Chang references and other Roelofsen reference fail to teach the embodiments of the invention recited in Claims 1 and 2 and included by dependency in Claims 3-9, 11-14, 16-17 and 19-22. Therefore, the combined teachings of these references does not render obvious any of these claims, and the §103 rejections should thus be removed.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 502117.

**SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:**

Motorola, Inc.  
1303 East Algonquin Road  
IL01/3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Schaumburg, IL 60196  
Customer Number: 22917

Attachments

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

**Valerie M. Davis**  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 50,203

Telephone: 847.576.6733  
Fax No.: 847.576.0721